

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |) | |
| |) | |
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | No.: 3:14-CR-147-TAV-DCP |
| |) | |
| DAVID MAYES, |) | |
| |) | |
| Defendant. |) | |

ORDER

This criminal case is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation entered by United States Magistrate Judge Debra C. Poplin on July 5, 2018 (the “R&R”) [Doc. 366]. In the R&R, Judge Poplin recommends that the defendant’s *pro se* motion for return of property [Doc. 349] be denied. There have been no timely objections to the R&R, and enough time has passed since the filing of the R&R to treat any objections as having been waived. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); Fed. R. Crim. P. 51.

After a careful review of the R&R, the Court is in agreement with Judge Poplin’s analysis and recommendation, which the Court adopts and incorporates into its ruling. Therefore, the Court **ACCEPTS IN WHOLE** the R&R [Doc. 366], and the defendant’s *pro se* motion for return of property [Doc. 349] is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Thomas A. Varlan
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE